

N00014-18-S-B002, Armored Reconnaissance Vehicle Industry Questions & Answers

Note: The Question and Answer period has been extended to 31 January, 2018.

Questions received to date:

Q1: Great job. Thank you for painting a vision of the future ARV. Are your schedules flexible? Can you give us more time?

A1: Yes. We have modified the schedule and provided you more time as indicated on the FEDBIZOPS and ONR web sites. White papers are now due on 15 February and proposals due on 2 April 2018.

Q2: Please clarify the white paper 5 page count?

A2: The cover page plus four pages of text constitute the 5 page count for RA1. We have raised the page count for RA2 white papers to 7 pages total (cover plus 6).

Q3: Will the Government release the attendance roster for teaming consideration?

A3: ONR is in the process of contacting all attendees requesting concurrence to release their contact information. Updates on this subject will be provided in the future.

Q4: Should we price out all phases of the efforts?

A4: Yes, price out all options by fiscal year.

Q5: Should Research Area 1 (RA1) and Research Area 2 (RA2) submissions be stand-alone?

A5: Yes, individual white papers should address RA1 or RA2 separately.

Q6: Must white papers for Research Area 2 (RA2) address both the “base” and “at-the-edge” concepts? Would you prefer separate White Papers for each of the RA2 Option 1B demonstrators?

A6: Yes. All RA2 Base Period Concept Studies must address both the “Base Variant” and “At the Edge” platforms.

A6: No. A single white paper can be provided to address the RA2 Base Period and either Option 1A or 1B. For Option 1B, you can address either or both of the technology demonstrator fabrication and test phases.

Q7: Will participation in Research Area 2 (RA2), “Basic Variant” or “At the Edge”, preclude companies from bidding on subsequent phases (RDT&E, ENO) of ARV?

A7: No, participation in the Office of Naval Research Science & Technology program will not preclude future participation in any Armored Reconnaissance Vehicle (ARV) acquisition activities.

Q8: For Research Area 2 (RA2) – is the 6 month test period part of the 17 & 23 months?

A8: No, the six (6) month government test period is in addition to the 17 and 23 month design and fabrication efforts. Note: these dates have changed slightly such that the Base Variant demonstrator

and At the Edge demonstrator timelines are the same. See the latest Amendment for more information on the schedule.

Q9: Can we submit technology solutions that address multiple Research Area 1 (RA1) thrust areas?

A9: Yes, you can submit separate white papers for as many technology focus areas as you desire.

Q10: Do you have a national program funding profile for FY2018 – FY 2021?

A10: Please refer to posted Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) and the Amendments for funding levels for the individual base efforts and options.

Q11: Are there any limits on the number of White Papers or potential RFPs per company?

A11: No, there are no limits on the number of white papers that can be submitted.

Q12: Does the proposal for the Base Variant have to include an AMUC cost analysis showing path to \$6M target?

A12: Yes. However, a detailed costing analysis that may be associated with a typical acquisition program is not expected. It is expected that estimated costs will be tracked and traced throughout the trade study at the platform work breakdown structure (WBS) level and then rolled up for a total unit cost estimate.

Q13: Does the AMUC price point include baseline payload /capability or does it only account for vehicle manufacturing costs?

A13: The provided Average Manufacturing Unit Cost (AMUC) should cover a platform capable of fulfilling the “Notional Technology Demonstrator Capabilities” contained in the [ONR BAA overview brief](#).

Q14: When would Combat Development and Integration (CD&I) expect a Concept of Operations to be available?

A14: A draft document is estimated to be delivered in Q3FY18 followed by a validated version in Q3FY19.

Q15: Can you discuss potential pathway if a small business is selected to work on component/subsystem (RA1) the pathway to have it work with a prime that is building a Full System under (RA2)? Will government or vehicle developers pick which RA1 technologies to integrate for T&E / Demo?

A15: ONR will facilitate a dialog between RA1 and RA2 Base Period vendors to discuss possible insertion of technologies into the demonstrators. We anticipate and expect communication between RA1 and RA2 performers to form cooperative arrangements as appropriate.

Q16: Item J on “At The Edge” slide indicates crew vision system. Is this meant to be direct optics such as vision block periscope or camera system that can provide each crew member independent vision anywhere around the vehicle using a common camera video system for crew situational awareness?

A16: For clarification, the “Notional Technology Demonstrator Capabilities” listed alphabetically on slides 29-32 on the [ONR BAA overview brief](#) are applicable to both the “Base” and “At the Edge” demonstrators. No technological solution is being recommended on any of the expected demonstrator

capabilities. Particular solutions to solve the stated capabilities are within the trade space of the S&T effort.

Q17: Is there any chance of accepting a fully tracked vehicle?

A17: All means of vehicle to ground surface interface are on the table and will be considered.

Q18: Is the ARV effort willing to evaluate increasing availability through increased repairability vice the DOD penchant for a high percentage of LRVs?

A18: Operational availability is of interest and is expressed in TFA 7 Logistics.

Q19: Has the government identified the GOV team responsible for software integration over the next 6 years?

A19: No.